

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	2
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND . . . . .	7
III. STANDARD FOR ISSUANCE OF AN INJUNCTION . . . . .	11
IV. ARGUMENT . . . . .	12
A. THE ARMY AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST WILL BE IRREPARABLY HARMED BY THE ISSUANCE OF A BLANKET INJUNCTION ON ALL STRYKER-RELATED PROJECTS AND TRAINING . . . . .	14
1. The irreparable harm that will be suffered by the Army and its soldiers from an injunction that prohibits the transformation of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Brigade is demonstrative and severe . . . . .	15
2. The Army has identified six specific projects in addition to training that are needed to prepare the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Brigade for combat deployment as a SBCT and are highly unlikely to cause environmental or cultural harm . . . . .	21
3. There are no viable alternatives to finishing the training of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Brigade as a SBCT at a location outside Hawaii and maintaining this unit as a light infantry brigade is improvident . . . . .	29
4. The Army Should be permitted to proceed with the critical SBCT projects because each has independent utility and their completion will not restrict the Army's ability to analyze reasonable alternatives in a SEIS . . . . .	34
B. PLAINTIFFS WILL NOT SUFFER IRREPARABLE HARM IF THE COURT ISSUES A LIMITED INJUNCTION PERMITTING TRANSFORMATION OF THE 2 <sup>ND</sup> BRIGADE . . . . .	39

1.	Plaintiffs cannot demonstrate irreparable harm to cultural resources . . . . .	42
2.	Plaintiffs cannot demonstrate irreparable harm to natural resources . . . . .	50
C.	THE BALANCE OF HARMS TIPS DECIDEDLY IN THE ARMY'S FAVOR . . . . .	54
D.	AN INJUNCTION PREVENTING THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE 2 <sup>ND</sup> BRIGADE TO A SBCT WOULD BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST . . . . .	58
V.	CONCLUSION . . . . .	60